

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 12 are amended. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 were rejected as being anticipated by Moore (US 2005/0052465). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a keyboard video mouse (KVM) switch for a plurality of computers to share a plurality of manipulating devices with different connection agreements. One key feature of the KVM switch is that it converts first electrical signals from manipulating devices into standard packets, routing the standard packets to the computers, and converting the standard packets into second electrical signals for the computers. The first electrical signals comply with the connection agreements of the source manipulating devices, and the second electrical signals comply with connection agreements of the connected computers. As described in the specification, the connection agreements of the source manipulating devices and the connection agreements of the connected computers are different. See, for example, the specification at paragraphs [0013] and [0032]. See also paragraphs [0007]-[0010] (describing problems of different connection agreements in the conventional art).

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to emphasize the different connection agreements. As amended, claim 1 expressly states: “wherein at least one of the source connection agreements [i.e. the connection agreements of the plurality of source manipulation devices] is different from at least one of the destination connection agreements [i.e. the connection agreements of the plurality of connected computers]”. The same language is also added to amended claim 12. These amendments are supported by the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0013] and [0032]. The applicant notes that the original claims 1 and 12 do recite “different connection agreements” in the preamble; the amended claims make this requirement clearer and more explicit.

Moore does not teach or suggest the above-quoted claim element. Moore describes a system having a local side 114 and a remote side 124. At the local side 114, a keyboard 118, a mouse 120, a local monitor 122, and a target computer 102 are connected to a local unit 116. At the remote side 124, a keyboard 128, a mouse 130, and a remote monitor 132 are connected to a remote computer 104, and the remote computer 104 is in turn connected to the remote unit 126. The local unit 116 and the remote unit 126 communicate with each other using a wireless

communication protocol (e.g. 802.11a). At the local side 114, the keyboard 118, mouse 120 and the target computer 102 all communicate with the local unit 116 using the PS/2 standard (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0022]). At the remote side 124, the keyboard 128 and mouse 130 communicate with the remote computer 104 using the PS/2 standard (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0024]).

Therefore, Moore does not teach or suggest that at least one of the connection agreements used for the manipulating devices (keyboards 118 and 128, mice 120 and 130) is different from at least one of the connection agreements used for the computers (102 and 104). The same standard (PS/2) is used in the Moore system for all manipulating devices and computers. Here, the applicant notes that Moore teaches the PS/2 standard as an example. The applicant is not arguing that Moore teaches only using PS/2; rather, the applicant is arguing that Moore teaches using the same connection agreement on both the local and remote sides for both the manipulating devices and the computers.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that Moore fails to teach or suggest "at least one of the source connection agreements is different from at least one of the destination connection agreements" as recited in amended claims 1 and 12. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Moore. Claims 2-11 and 13-21 depend from claims 1 or 12 and are therefore also patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 625-5076 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response or deficient in fees, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-3531.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb. 23, 2009

By: /Ying Chen/  
Ying Chen  
Registration No. 50,193  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

255 S. Grand Ave., #215, Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Phone: 213-625-5076; Fax: 213-625-0691